

## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <a href="http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content">http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content</a>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Barnabas at some place in Asia Minor, Greece, or Macedonia and probably for Christians in Palestine. The Book of Revelation is from the hand of the apostle John about 70 A.D. The gospel's origin is explained on the two-document theory. Mark probably appeared before the year 70, Matthew about 72–75, and Luke about 80. The third evangelist, who was Luke the "beloved physician" and companion of Paul, may have known the First Gospel, not at first hand but by report. Acts was written about 85 A.D., and the contradictions between it and the Pauline letters which are sometimes noted are thought to be mainly imaginary. The apostle John is also the author of the Fourth Gospel and the three epistless all written near the end of the first century. While Professor Gregory', opinions command a hearing because of his reputation as a scholar, it is very doubtful whether some of them could be critically defended.

SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

## THE COMPOSITION OF MARK'S GOSPELI

Wendling's work on the Gospel of Mark has scarcely received the attention which it deserves. His previous volume (Ur-Marcus, 1905) exhibited a somewhat mechanical theory of first, second, and third hands (M<sup>1</sup>, M<sup>2</sup>, M<sup>3</sup>) contributing their respective parts to our canonical gospel, when the student public was but just aware of its success in demonstrating that Mark as we know it is the synoptic Grundschrift. A century of critical conflict calls for a breathing-spell, after the achievement of so important a stage as this, before being urged to new labors of analysis. It would be so comfortable now to rest quietly at the point where Papias' Elder leaves us. Mark, having attended Peter as his intrepreter, wrote down Peter's discourses as he remembered them. His order is imperfect because the discourses of Peter were occasional, and writing only after Peter's death he could not learn the true sequence, but for the rest Mark is a faithful transcript of Peter's discourses. This account of differences between Mark and other gospels satisfied the second century. Why not the twentieth? Wrede and Wellhausen, Loisy and Nicolardot are disturbers of the peace, and must expect even those who accept critical results up to the point above defined to manifest impatience when they tell us that even our earliest canonical gospel has between it and the real beginnings a long history of development through many stages, both oral and written.

<sup>1</sup> Die Entstehung des Marcus-Evangeliums. Philologische Untersuchungen von Prof. Dr. Emil Wendling. Tübingen: Mohr, 1908. 250 pages. M. 8.

And yet who questions today the evidence of redactional recasting and adaptation afforded by the shorter and longer endings of Mark, and the blank of accident or cancellation which they were written to replace? Some redactional work has been done upon Mark; this is undeniable. And the admission justifies the attempt of Wendling and others to trace its history.

On the whole we must accord to Nicolardot the palm for logical method. Comparison of the redactional treatment of Mark by Matthew and Luke respectively is a needful school for the determination in a truly impartial and objective spirit of the actual "process of redaction." Comparison of their respective treatment of the teaching-source common to them, but comparatively unknown to Mark, is the next step logically. Lastly should come application of the results to Mark. It is surprising, in view of the broad differences of method to how great a degree the different critics achieve identical results. The present writer found it necessary in his recent Beginnings of Gospel Story to insert a statement in the Preface, after the work had been placed in the publisher's hands, that his own results in the analysis of Mark into Petrine narrative, embellishments drawn from the teaching-source, and untraceable or redactional material were quite independent of Loisy's. Practically the same would have been said of Wendling's had the present volume appeared in time. The degree of coincidence can hardly be accounted for without some basis of real fact.

Wendling's study displays German philological criticism at its keenest. The minuteness of his study recalls that of Spitta. We commend especially its bearing on the question of the Paulinism of Mark so defiantly denied by Schweitzer. The book will appear most open to criticism in the rigor with which the author seeks to carry through his own somewhat mechanical theory of composition of the gospel. Its strong point is philological discrimination whereby even those who dissent from the theory may be greatly profited.

BENJAMIN W. BACON

YALE DIVINITY SCHOOL NEW HAVEN, CONN.

## STUDIES IN THE ORIGINS OF CHRISTIANITY

The perennial interest in primitive Christianity and the strenuousness of the efforts of modern historians to work back from beneath the accumulation of customs and beliefs which we now call Christianity to the origins of the faith are well illustrated in Windisch's exhaustive work on the early